

Serial No.: 09/918,062

Art Unit: 2137

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed February 16, 2006.

1. Response to Objections of Claims

Claims 1 and 9 were objected for having informalities. The claims have been amended in a manner suggested in the Office Action to clarify that whether a token is that of the intended recipient or the sender. Applicants respectfully submit that the objections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

2. Response to Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 3 has been amended to clarify that the language of the claim is referring to the "obtaining a second token of the sender" step of claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

3. Response to Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 and 14-19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Linsker* (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,473) in view of *Mazzagatte* (U.S. Patent No. 6,862,583) in further view of *Menezes* (Handbook of Applied Cryptography). It is well-established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

a. Independent Claim 1

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* in view of *Mazzagatte* in further view of *Menezes* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "receiving and securely retaining a digital document and a transmitted independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient at a printout station, an encrypted digest of the document created by the sender using a

Serial No.: 09/918,062
Art Unit: 2137

hash algorithm, the digest being encrypted using a first token of the sender" or "decoding encrypted identification data with the first token of the intended recipient, the encrypted identification data being identification data from the independently verifiable data record that is encrypted using a second token of the recipient by a transmitting station," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action cites *Mazzagatte* in support of disclosing the features directed at verifying the identity of an intended recipient of a document. However, *Mazzagatte* teaches that encryption and decryption operations are both performed at a print node. Thus, *Mazzagatte* fails to teach or show an "independently verifiable data record that is encrypted using a second token of the recipient by a transmitting station," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added). Likewise, *Mazzagatte* fails to teach or show "receiving and securely retaining a digital document and a transmitted independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient at a printout station," as recited in the claim.

Linkster is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagatte* for at least the reason that *Linkster* does not teach or suggest that information is encrypted using a token of an intended recipient and then transmitted. In contrast, *Linsker* teaches that information is encrypted using a token of a sender and then transmitted. *Menezes* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagatte* and *Linkster* for at least the reason that *Menezes* does not teach or suggest using a token of an intended recipient to encrypt information that is transmitted by a sender to the recipient.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not obvious under the proposed combination, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-8

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-8 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-8 contain all features/elements of independent claim 1. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

c. Independent Claim 9

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* in view of *Mazzagatte* in further view of

Serial No.: 09/918,062
Art Unit: 2137

Menezes does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "encoding identification data of the intended recipient using the first token of the intended recipient" and "sending the encrypted digest, the digital document, the second token of the sender, and the encoded identification data to the recipient," as recited in claim 9.

The Office Action cites *Mazzagatte* in support of disclosing the features directed at verifying the identity of an intended recipient of a document. However, *Mazzagatte* teaches that encryption and decryption operations are both performed at a print node. Thus, *Mazzagatte* fails to teach or show "'encoding identification data of the intended recipient using the first token of the intended recipient" and "sending the encrypted digest, the digital document, the second token of the sender, and the encoded identification data to the recipient," as recited in the claim. Likewise, *Mazzagatte* fails to teach or show "receiving and securely retaining a transmitted document, the encoded identification data, and a transmitted independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient at a printout station," as recited in the claim.

Linkster is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagatte* for at least the reason that *Linkster* does not teach or suggest that information is encrypted using a token of an intended recipient and then transmitted. In contrast, *Linsker* teaches that information is encrypted using a token of a sender and then transmitted. *Menezes* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagatte* and *Linkster* for at least the reason that *Menezes* does not teach or suggest using a token of an intended recipient to encrypt information that is transmitted by a sender to the recipient.

For at least these reasons, claim 9 is not obvious under the proposed combination, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 10-12 and 14-17

Because independent claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 10-12 and 14-17 (which depend from independent claim 9) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 10-12 and 14-17 contain all features/elements of independent claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 09/918,062
Art Unit: 2137

e. Independent Claim 18

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 18, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* in view of *Mazzagatte* in further view of *Menezes* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a communications module arranged to receive an electronic version of the transmitted document over a communications network, an independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient, a first token of the intended recipient, an encrypted digest of the document created by the sender using a hash algorithm, the digest being encrypted using a first token of the sender, a second token relating to the first token of the sender, and encrypted identification data of the intended recipient, the encrypted identification data being encrypted using a first token of the intended recipient," as recited in claim 18.

The Office Action cites *Mazzagatte* in support of disclosing the features directed at verifying the identity of an intended recipient of a document. However, *Mazzagatte* teaches that encryption and decryption operations are both performed at a print node. Thus, *Mazzagatte* fails to teach or show "a communications module arranged to receive an electronic version of the transmitted document over a communications network, an independently verifiable data record of the intended recipient, a first token of the intended recipient, an encrypted digest of the document created by the sender using a hash algorithm, the digest being encrypted using a first token of the sender, a second token relating to the first token of the sender, and encrypted identification data of the intended recipient, the encrypted identification data being encrypted using a first token of the intended recipient," as recited in the claim.

Linkster is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagate* for at least the reason that *Linkster* does not teach or suggest that information is encrypted using a token of an intended recipient and then transmitted. In contrast, *Linsker* teaches that information is encrypted using a token of a sender and then transmitted. *Menezes* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagate* and *Linkster* for at least the reason that *Menezes* does not teach or suggest using a token of an intended recipient to encrypt information that is transmitted by a sender to the recipient.

For at least these reasons, claim 18 is not obvious under the proposed combination, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 09/918,062
Art Unit: 2137

f. Independent Claim 19

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 19, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Linsker* in view of *Mazzagatte* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a controller arranged to create a digest of the document using a hash algorithm and to encrypt the digest using a first token of the sender and to encrypt identification data of the intended recipient using a first token of the intended recipient" and "a communications module arranged to obtain a second token of the sender related to the first token of the sender, which can be used to decrypt the encrypted digest and to send the encrypted digest, the digital document, the second token of the sender, the encrypted identification data of the intended recipient, and the first token of the intended recipient to the recipient," as recited in claim 19.

The Office Action cites *Mazzagatte* in support of disclosing the features directed at verifying the identity of an intended recipient of a document. However, *Mazzagatte* teaches that encryption and decryption operations are both performed at a print node. Thus, *Mazzagatte* fails to teach or show "a controller arranged to create a digest of the document using a hash algorithm and to encrypt the digest using a first token of the sender and to encrypt identification data of the intended recipient using a first token of the intended recipient" and "a communications module arranged to obtain a second token of the sender related to the first token of the sender, which can be used to decrypt the encrypted digest and to send the encrypted digest, the digital document, the second token of the sender, the encrypted identification data of the intended recipient, and the first token of the intended recipient to the recipient," as recited in the claim.

Linkster is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagatte* for at least the reason that *Linkster* does not teach or suggest that information is encrypted using a token of an intended recipient and then sent to a recipient. In contrast, *Linsker* teaches that information is encrypted using a token of a sender and then transmitted. *Menezes* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Mazzagatte* and *Linkster* for at least the reason that *Menezes* does not teach or suggest using a token of an intended recipient to encrypt information that is transmitted by a sender to the recipient.

For at least these reasons, claim 19 is not obvious under the proposed combination, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 09/918,062

Art Unit: 2137


4. Response to Rejection of Claim Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Linsker* in view of *Mazzagatte* in further view of *Menezes* in further view of *Clark* (U.S. Patent 5,448,045). Because independent claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claim 13 (which depends from independent claim 9) is allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claim 13 contains all features/elements of independent claim 9 and *Clark* does not remedy the deficiencies of the *Linkster*, *Mazzagatte*, and *Menezes* references. Accordingly, the rejection to this claim should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles W. Griggers
Reg. No. 47,283

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

☐ **BLACK BORDERS**

☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**

☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**

☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**

☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**

☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**

☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.